1	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669		
	City Attorney		
2	JOANNE HÖEPER, State Bar #114961		
	Chief Trial Deputy		
3	PETER J. KEITH, State Bar #206482		
	MARK D. LIPTON, State Bar #152864		
4	Deputy City Attorney 1390 Market Street, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor		
ا ہے	1390 Market Street, 0 F100r		
5	San Francisco, California 94102-5408		
_	Telephone: (415) 554-4218 (Lipton) Telephone: (415) 554-3908 (Keith)		
6	Facsimile: (415) 554-3837		
7	E-Mail: mark.lipton@sfgov.org		
′	E-Mail: peter.keith@sfgov.org		
8	D Wall. peter.kelare sigov.org		
0	Attorneys for Defendants		
9	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,		
	HEATHER FONG, AND MICHAEL HENNESSEY		
0			
	CHE L. HASHIM, Esq., State Bar #238565		
$\lfloor 1 \rfloor$	Law Offices of Che L. Hashim		
	861 Bryant Street		
12	San Francisco, CA 94103		
	Telephone: (415) 487-1700		
13	Facsimile: (415) 431-1312		
	Email: che.hashim.esq@gmail.com		
l4			
_	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
15	LUKE SMITH		
l6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
'	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
18	TORTIERI DIST	Mer or entire out	41
	LUKE SMITH,	Case No. CV-10-3544	4 EDL
9	,		
	Plaintiff,		
20	,	[PROPOSED] STIP	ULATED ORDER
	VS.	<b>AUTHORIZING DI</b>	
21		CONFIDENTIAL C	RIMINAL HISTORY
	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		THE POSSESSION OF
22	POLICE and SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENTS,		Y AND COUNTY OF SAN
	municipal corporations; HEATHER FONG in	FRANCISCO	
23	her capacity as chief of police for CITY AND		
	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, MICHAEL	* 1	
24	HENNESSEY, in his capacity as sheriff for	Judge:	Judge Laporte
	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN	T ' 1 D /	NI C
25	FRANCISCO, 1-100, inclusive; individually	Trial Date:	None Set
	and in their capacities as POLICE OFFICERS and SHERIFF'S DEPUTIES for the CITY		
26	AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.		
27	AND COUNT FOR SANTKANCISCO.		
- '	Defendants.		
,,	Deteriounio.		

## **STIPULATION**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) the parties have met and conferred and stipulate as follows:

- 1. Good cause exists for the Court to authorize the parties to this action to receive certain "state summary criminal history information," as defined in California Penal Code section 11105(a), in the possession of the City and County of San Francisco. Namely:
- 2. Plaintiff Luke Smith contends, *inter alia*, that the Defendant City and County of San Francisco erroneously allowed an arrestee to assume the identity of Mr. Smith, which ultimately led to the issuance of a bench warrant for Mr. Smith when the impostor did not appear for his prosecution under Mr. Smith's name in San Francisco Superior Court. Plaintiff Luke Smith further contends that the City and County of San Francisco erred when Mr. Smith was later arrested pursuant to the same bench warrant and that the City and County of San Francisco failed to timely determine that Mr. Smith was not the correct person wanted pursuant to the bench warrant.
- 3. In connection with the arrest and booking process in San Francisco, various documents are generated that contain information such as unique identifying information based on fingerprints and criminal histories. This information is used in connection with making identification and custody decisions and it is therefore relevant to Mr. Smith's claims in this action. However, at least some of the information contained in these documents is or could be considered "state summary criminal history information," is subject to protection under California law. Section 11142 of the California Penal Code makes it a misdemeanor to disclose state summary criminal history information to a person who is not authorized to receive such information. However, under section 11140 of the California Penal Code, a court may authorize persons to receive such information. Because good cause exists for discovery of the state summary criminal history information that was generated in connection with the subject arrests and bookings in this action, the parties respectfully request that the Court authorize San Francisco to disclose that information in discovery.

1//

4. State summary criminal history information produced in this action shall be treated as 1 confidential information subject to the terms of the Stipulated Protective Order in this action. 2 IT IS SO STIPULATED. 3 4 5 Dated: January 14, 2010 6 DENNIS J. HERRERA City Attorney 7 JOANNE HOEPER Chief Trial Deputy 8 PETER J. KEITH MARK D. LIPTON 9 **Deputy City Attorneys** 10 /s/ Peter J. Keith PETER J. KEITH 11 12 Attorneys for CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, 13 HEATHER FONG, AND MICHAEL HENNESSEY 14 Dated: January 14, 2011 15 LAW OFFICES OF CHE L. HASHIM 16 By: /s/\* Che L. Hashim 17 CHE L. HASHIM 18 Attorneys for LUKE ŠMITH 19 \*Pursuant to GO 45, the electronic signatory has obtained approval from this signatory. 20 **ORDER** 21 BASED ON THE ABOVE ENTERED STIPULATION, the City and County of San Francisco 22 is authorized to release state summary criminal history information pursuant to the terms of the 23 foregoing stipulation. 24 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED Dated: 26 Judge Elizabeth D. Laport 27 THE HONOR UNITED STA 28 [Proposed] Stipulated Order Re: Criminal History Info 3 10253\00673728.doc Smith v. CCSF, et al. – USDC No. CV-10-3544 EDL